REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for the interview held with applicants' representatives on March 2, 2006. During the interview, proposed amendments to the independent claims were discussed, as well as the cited art and rejections of record. It was concluded that the proposed amendments appeared to productively advance the claims, subject to an additional review of the art by the Examiner and pending an additional search. Accordingly, the claims as presented herein reflect the proposed amendments as discussed, and entry is respectfully requested. Specifically, independent method claims 1, 10, 17 and 21, and corresponding computer program product claim 25 have been amended, together with various dependent claims (4, 6, 14, 27, 29 and 33), while claim 20 has been cancelled and claim 34 has been added.

Accordingly, by this paper, claims 1-19 and 21-34 are presented for reconsideration.

Claims 17 and 27 were objected to for minor informalities, while claims 2, 6. 14, 29 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for various limitations failing to have antecedent basis or for containing trademarks. As is reflected in the above claim listing, these objected to and rejected claims have each been amended to correct any problems related to informalities, antecedent basis, or use of trademarks.

The remaining rejections of record primarily concern rejection of claims (e.g., claims 1-3, 7-13. 16-27 and 30-33) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,889,229 (Wong).[1] Additional dependent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wong in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,578,068 (Bowman-Amuah).

As discussed during the interview, Wong (see Fig. 1) describes a method for "peer-to-peer replication of objects" between various nodes connected over a network. In particular, Wong teaches a replication process for replicating user-defined objects to make them available to other nodes. (Col. 1, ll. 7-10). In Wong, users may define classes and generate, store and receive multiple user-defined objects based on each class. (Col. 1, ll. 39-43).

If data is shared with other users on a network, a database may be copied onto a new node that does not have a copy of the database. (Col. 2, ll. 53-56). Wong discloses that if such a

[1] Since Wong qualifies as "prior" art, if at all, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), applicants reserve the right to challenge the status of that reference as qualifying "prior" art. Accordingly, any statement or comment herein to Wong is made merely for purposes of argument, and assumes *arguendo* that the reference is proper qualifying prior art.

database includes a user-defined object, conventional replication is inadequate and a special procedure is required. (Col. 2, ll. 55-58). According to Wong, in such a case the node on which the user-defined object is located creates a replication group of objects, including any user-defined objects. (Col. 6, ll. 41-56; Col. 8, ll. 25-43). Thereafter, a database server on the node copies data defining the user-defined object to a data structure on a second node. (Col. 9, ll. 25-31). Subsequently, a database server routine replicates the data by first copying the name of the user-defined object to the new node. (Col. 10, ll. 31-35). Data defining the user-defined object is then copied to the new node, and data defining the database object is then copied from the data dictionary. (Col. 10, ll. 40-45, 52-60). A data dictionary is an object that includes, for example, the name of a particular table, the type of each column in the table, an the name of a user-defined object. (Col. 6, ll. 31-41; Col. 7, ll. 44-46). Finally, the new node may instantiate the database object based on data in the data dictionary. Importantly, however, Wong does not disclose or suggest any central location from objects are defined in the same way, as opposed to peer-to-peer sharing of update definitions of such objects.

In contrast, and as recited in the claims herein, Applicants' claimed methods and computer program product are directed to a method for deploying one or more data types from a back end server at a first tier to one or more additional servers at a middle tier *in a manner that creates consistency across all middle tier servers in communication with a back end server.* The method is comprised of an act of "creating or modifying *a special table in a database of the back end server, the special table including one or more fields for storing data identifying data types and corresponding code* for enabling use of each of the data types." Emphasis added. Additionally, the back end server acts as "*a single and centralized source from which all middle tier servers obtain data types and the corresponding code required to enable use of the data types.*" Emphasis added. As also recited, "a data type to be deployed from the back end server to the one or more middle tier servers is identified and an extended assembly corresponding to the data type is obtained from the special table." The "extended assembly is then transmitted to the middle tier server *in a manner that preserves consistency and compatibility among the middle tier servers.*" Emphasis added.

As noted at the interview, Applicants' claimed method as set forth in the independent method and computer program product claims as presented herein is clearly different from the disclosed distribution of data types created by a user at one node to another node such that data

types are replicated peer-to-peer, as taught by Wong. Wong specifically teaches the transfer of user-defined objects, such that *each node can potentially have different objects*, depending on the user of the node. As a result, each node disclosed in Wong can have its own, unique user-defined objects which *each node then replicates to other nodes*. Thus, multiple nodes may replicate their unique user-defined objects to other nodes. Applicants claimed invention, in contrast, transmits all data types from *a single and centralized back end server* which operates at a different tier than the recipient systems.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons,[2] Applicants' claimed invention is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Wong, either singly or in combination with any other reference of record.

Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. In the event the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to allowance that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 10th day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:ccn:aam
AAM0000000410V001

[2] Applicants also note that newly added claim 34 is allowable for at least the same reasons as noted above. In addition, however, Wong teaches sending data defining a user-defined object separate from the name of the object, such that at least two separate transmissions are required before a node can use the new object. (*See, e.g.*, abstract; Col. 10, ll. 31-65; Fig. 3). As a result, Wong fails to teach a single data structure that includes all the data required to enable the one or more middle tier servers to use the data type.